



AF

IFW

Docket No.: 062807-0023

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 20277
Toshimichi KISHIMOTO, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 9299
Application No.: 10/021,550	:	Group Art Unit: 2134
Filed: December 18, 2001	:	Examiner: P. Poltorak
For: DISK MANAGEMENT INTERFACE	:	

**WRITTEN REPLY PROVIDING STATEMENT
OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Interview Summary mailed January 13, 2006 included a requirement for a Statement of the Substance of the December 20, 2005 interview. It is believed that the comments on the interview contained in the remarks sections of Applicants' December 23, 2005 response provided the required statement of substance. However, to insure compliance with the new requirement apparently imposed by the January 13, 2006 Interview Summary, comments regarding the interview are reiterated below.

Applicants' representative would like to express his appreciation to Examiner Poltorak for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview conducted on December 20, 2005. Prior to the interview, a proposed amendment addressing method claims 17-21 was submitted and patentability of the proposed versions of the method claims (particularly 17, 19 and 21) was discussed at some length in the accompanying remarks. Applicants' position on patentability, as

• **Application No.:** 10/021,550

discussed at the interview, was substantially similar to that set forth in the remarks accompanying the proposed claim amendment.

Several of the documents applied in previous art rejections, such as Huang and Moshfeghi, were briefly mentioned. Although the Examiner did not rely on specific references, he repeatedly questioned whether or not general teachings of web site access, management access and/or addressing functions would meet or render obvious proposed claim language that he felt was still somewhat broad. No agreement was reached as to the patentability of any claim.

However, the Examiner did indicate that he was unlikely to permit entry of amendments like those proposed to claim 17 after final rejection. Hence, Applicants filed a request for continued examination (RCE) with the December 23, 2005 response, to obtain entry and full consideration of the further amended claims.

In view of the Examiner's positions taken in the interview, claims were further amended in the subsequent response. Remarks accompanying the response set forth Applicants' positions on patentability of the versions of the claims now pending in this application.

It is believed that the pre-Interview proposal, the Interview Summary, Applicants' December 23, 2005 response, and this written reply to the Interview Summary provide an adequate record of the substance discussed at the December 20, 2005 interview. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in a further interview or an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of

• **Application No.:** 10/021,550

this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Keith E. George

Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8603 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 19, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**